

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 22, 2005. Claims 12 to 30 are in the application, of which Claims 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24 and 26 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, these claims have been amended in keeping with the guidelines at MPEP § 2106, such that the computer-executable programs claimed therein are “stored on a computer-readable memory medium”. Withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 12 to 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,228,118 (Sasaki). The rejections are all respectfully traversed.

First, with respect to Claims 22 to 30, all of these claims are supported by Japanese priority application 4-186357, from which this case claims priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and which was filed in Japan on June 19, 1992. This filing date pre-dates the effective date of Sasaki (i.e., June 25, 1992). A sworn translation of Japan priority application 4-186357 was filed in parent application No. 08/076,085, and an additional copy of the sworn translation is enclosed herewith. Accordingly, with respect to Claims 22 to 30, Sasaki is not prior art and removal of Sasaki against these claims is respectfully requested. Moreover, since no other rejections were entered against Claims 22 to 30, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 12 to 21, these claims concern information processing in which identification information is acquired from an external apparatus, wherein the identification information specifies one of a plurality of device control languages with a highest priority. In addition, based on this identification information, a selection is made from a plurality of programs so as to select a program corresponding to the device control language specified by the identification information.

It is therefore one feature of the invention that a plurality of device control languages are provided with respective priorities, and based on acquired identification information which specifies one of a plurality of device control languages with a highest priority, a selection is made.

For its part, Sasaki shows a printing system including a printer and a data processor, wherein the printer has at least one interpreter for interpreting print data, and wherein the data processor has a plurality of printer drivers. However, in their study of Sasaki, Applicants are unable to find any mention of a plurality of device control languages provided with respective priorities. As a consequence, Sasaki is unrelated to the invention in that it does not acquire identification information which specifies one of a plurality of device control languages with a highest priority from an external apparatus, and in that it does not make a selection of a program from a plurality of programs corresponding to a device control language specified by the acquired identification information.

Page 4 of the Office Action indicated that portions of columns 5 and 8 in Sasaki describe a plurality of device control languages with respective priorities. Applicants respectfully disagree. It is true that column 5 describes a plurality of

interpreters, but there are no priorities given to any of these interpreters. Conversely, it is true that column 8 describes priority orders, but these priorities are associated with printer drivers and are not associated with any of Sasaki's interpreters. Thus, although Sasaki's data processor acquires interpreter ID data from a printer, the interpreter ID data is provided to specify the respective interpreters, and not to indicate the priorities of the interpreters. It naturally follows, therefore, that the interpreter ID data cannot somehow specify an interpreter with a highest priority.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Sasaki does not anticipate any of Claims 12 to 21, and withdrawal of the rejection over Sasaki is therefore respectfully requested.

Regarding a formal matter, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to indicate her acceptance of the formal drawings filed with this application on September 22, 2003.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 106511v1